Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The idea that life is an exile and the true home of the soul is elsewhere can be traced back to various passages of the *Republic* and even to Empedocles. Below, Nauck, p. 108, l. 6, instead of ἐπαναμιμνήσκει δ' ἑαυτὸν ὧν ἔχων ἐπελάθετο we should probably read ἑκὼν ἐπελάθετο. Cf. Aeschyl. *Ag.* 39 and Herod. 4. 43. This suits the thought, for the exiled soul was drawn down to this lower world not only by fate but by its own fault—διά τινα μοχθηρίαν τῆς ψυχῆς, *ibid.* l. 26.

PAUL SHOREY

NOTES ON TWO COMPOUNDS OF *FIGO*

I. *Praefigere.* Ps.-Quint, *Declam.* x. 8. Among the uses of *praefigere* Forcellini, *s.v. praefigo*, Harper, and Georges give "enchant, bewitch, bezaubern," referring only to a passage in one of the Declamations attributed to Quintilian (Ps.-Quint. *Declam.* x. 8), Harper marking it with the asterisk that denotes the meaning as of a single occurrence. The subject of the declamation is "The Enchanted Tomb," *Sepulcrum Incantatum*, and the case is this: A woman saw in sleep every night a son whom she had recently lost by death. She told of this to her husband. He called in a professional magician and had him stop these visitations by incantations over the tomb. The wife brings suit against her husband for cruelty. The grief of the mother when her son does not appear in the night as usual is expatiated upon in the declamation. Finally she goes to the tomb, and *quam tum illa praefixum clausumque tumulum nudis cecidit uberibus! Praefixum* is translated in these lexicons "enchanted." The tomb is enchanted beyond any doubt, and the reader knows it; but does *praefixum* contain that idea in itself? Are not both *praefixum* and *clausum* used with but a slight figurative extension of their ordinary significance, receiving purely from the context whatever other connotation they may suggest to a reader who knows the circumstances of the treatment of the tomb? I should be inclined to place this reference under the heading "close, block up," a well-attested meaning of *praefigo*, and to think the claim for "bewitch, enchant," on the strength of this passage, quite untenable.

II. *Configere.* Prov. 22:23. *Configere* is used several times in the Vulgate in a literal sense, "to pierce, nail together": John 19:37; Zech. 12:10; 13:3. There is, however, another use that seems quite distinct from this. In the Vulgate, Prov. 22:23, we have, to translate in part, "thou shalt not do wrong to the poor man nor oppress the needy, for the Lord will plead his cause," *et configet eos qui confixerunt animam eius.* The meaning of the Hebrew word Ḳābhaʿ translated by *configet* and *confixerunt* is uncertain. A recent Hebrew dictionary, that of Brown-Driver-Briggs, says that it meant perhaps "rob, injure, wrong generally." An older one of somewhat less authority (Fuerst *Hebrew Lexicon*) gives "intertwine, plan cunning device, defraud, disappoint." A modern Hebrew word

derived from it means "deceive." The Greek versions are as follows: Septuagint, *καὶ ῥύσῃ σὴν ἄσυλον ψυχήν;* Aquila, *καὶ καθηλώσει τοὺς καθηλώσαντας αὐτόν;* Symmachus, *καὶ κολάσεται τοὺς κολαζομένους ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ.* The King James version translates "and spoil the soul of those that spoiled them," for which the Revised Version substitutes "and despoil of life those that despoil them."

Again in Mal. 3:8, the Vulgate has *Si affiget homo Deum, quia vos configitis me? Et dixistis in quo configimus te? In decimis et in primitiis,* where the Hebrew word translated by forms of *configo* is the same as in the other passage. In Greek we have: Septuagint, *μήτι πτερνιεῖ ἄνθρωπος θεόν; διότι ὑμεῖς πτερνίζετέ με;* Aquila and Symmachus, *μὴ ἀποστερήσει ἄνθρωπος θεὸν; ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἀποστερεῖτέ με.*

There is also an Itala version which used *fraudavimus et configimus, fraudatis et configitis* for the *configimus* and *configitis* of the other translation. The King James and Revised Versions are in accord with "rob" for each occurrence of the word. From these passages the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and before it Weitenaner's *Lexicon Biblicum* and Forcellini give as a meaning of *configere,* "defraudare, privare, cheat, rob." The divergence of the Greek texts plainly shows that the Hebrew was obscure at an early date. In the passage in Proverbs the Septuagint in particular admits its obscurity by translating the idea which must be contained in the passage rather than the words themselves, "And will preserve his soul inviolate." Most interesting is Aquila: *καθηλόω* means "nail or fasten down," and, as far as I can find, nothing but that (Liddell and Scott; *Thes. L. Gr.,* "*clavis defigo, configo*"). The passages evidently demand a word with the meaning of "rob" or the like. The context in itself would be sufficient to tempt a translator or commentator who did not understand the word used to translate or interpret it as though that were what it meant. This is one way of handling such a problem. Another is to give the general sense and let the words go as the Septuagint did. But there is a third way possible. If he does not understand the significance of a word, but knows, or thinks he knows, the literal meaning, a conscientious man will probably use that word in his own language that seems closest, and leave the difficulty of interpretation just as he found it. It is barely possible that Aquila with *καθηλόω,* the Itala with *fraudare et configere,* and St. Jerome with *configere* alone, followed independently the third method and came to conclusions so strikingly similar. But we know that St. Jerome had the Greek versions as well as the Hebrew before him in his work, and it seems improbable that the author of the other Latin text did not also use them, even, possibly, without the Hebrew. Aquila had the reputation in antiquity, and deservedly, of a careful and exact translator. St. Jerome himself in his *ep. ad Damas,* 12, says of him "non contentiosius ut quidam putant sed studiosius verbum interpretatur ad verbum." So it seems to me that Aquila's version of Prov. 22:23 is the source of the use of *configo* in both

versions and in both passages of the Latin. The Itala would seem a compromise (in itself implying that even in such a context *configere* could not carry the meaning *fraudare*) between a sense of duty to literalness and a desire to have the passage make sense, a compromise to which St. Jerome evidently did not feel impelled. At any rate it seems impossible, other evidence failing, to accord credence to the interpretation given almost without question by the lexicographers, that *configere* has the meaning "fraudare, rob."

CLARA LOUISE THOMPSON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Miss Thompson has shown that "cheat, rob" should not be admitted as a meaning of *configo*, and has offered the attractive suggestion that the use of *configo* in the passages from which this meaning has been deduced is in imitation of καθηλόω in Aquila's version of Prov. 22:23. How did Aquila come to use καθηλόω? In the obscure Hebrew word there appears to be nothing which could have suggested to him καθηλόω as a literal translation. He must have intended to render the phrase as a whole (in our Revised Version "despoil of life") with some notion of violent injury, as did other translators into Greek with κολάσεται or βιάσεται. Compounds of ἠλόω are occasionally used figuratively in classical times, and especially an ecclesiastical writer of the second century A.D., like Aquila, for whom καθηλόω had the special connotation "nail to the cross, crucify," might well employ it in the sense "cause to suffer," or "destroy." Cf. the figurative use of σταυρόω in Gal. 5:24: ἐσταύρωσαν τὴν σάρκα κτλ., "crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof."

The Septuagint, Ps. 118:120 has καθήλωσον ἐκ τοῦ φόβου σου τὰς σάρκας μου, ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν κριμάτων σου ἐφοβήθην. But the Hebrew means, according to the RV, "my flesh trembled for fear of thee; and I am afraid of thy judgments." The verb which is rendered "trembled" is given in the last edition of Gesenius-Buhl (1910), p. 541, as probably related to a modern Hebrew word meaning "nail." Whether or not the verb is actually related to this word for "nail," the translator's acquaintance with the latter may be confidently assumed and will account for his hitting upon καθηλόω. (Aquila also has ἠλώθη.) But as regards the sense, the clause, especially with its shift to the imperative construction, cannot correspond even remotely to the Hebrew original, and does not go well even with the concluding clause in the Greek. Did it mean anything to the translator? Not necessarily, and perhaps we should do well to drop the matter at this point. But if we may venture to correct to καθήλωσα and assume a figurative meaning, either "constrain" or "crucify," we secure at least a consistent sentence: "I have constrained (or crucified) my flesh from fear of thee, for of thy judgments I was afraid."—C. D. BUCK.]